



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,058	10/23/2003	Yun-Hee Cho	3364P145	1553

8791 7590 03/06/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

LE, THI Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/693,058	Applicant(s) CHO ET AL.	
	Examiner Thi Q. Le	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 12/05/2006. **Claims 1-10** still pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL**

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 2613

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bordogna et al. (US Patent #6,683,855)** in view of **Blair et al. (US Patent 7,028,241)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Bordogna et al. clearly show and disclose; an optical transmission system including a plurality of layers, the system comprising: a digital wrapper interrupt processor for processing an interrupt signal generated from the digital wrapper according to monitoring of the received signal (read as, checking parity bits for error, so that forward error correction can be enable or disable) (figure 8; column 9 lines 25-31); a defect and maintenance signal detector for determining whether or not the received signal has a defect (read as, error) and determining whether or not the received signal requires maintenance under the control of the digital wrapper interrupt processor (read as, when error is detected and forward error correction is enable, the data is stored and FEC correction bits are calculated to determine the location of the errors) (figure 8; column 9 lines 32-36); a defect and maintenance signal processor for, when a defect is detected by the defect and maintenance signal detector or is cancelled, processing the defect (read as, correcting the error as shows in block 808) (figure 8; column 9 lines 32-40).

Bordogna et al. fail to disclose, an optical transponder having a digital wrapper, the optical transponder operates to execute maintenance of a received signal in the optical transponder; and a digital wrapper controller for controlling the digital wrapper according to the processing result of the defect and maintenance signal processor.

Art Unit: 2613

In related art, Blair et al. disclose, an optical transponder (read as, output edge component 244; figure 12) having a digital wrapper (read as, frame structure; figure 5), the optical transponder operates to execute maintenance of a received signal in the optical transponder (read as, the output edge component 244 performs FEC decoding and correcting errors in data frame; column 13 lines 63-65); and a digital wrapper controller (read as, FEC/FDC byte allocator 252; figure 12) for controlling the digital wrapper according to the processing result of the defect and maintenance signal processor (read as, the output edge component 244 detects error in the data, “error data” are generated. The error data is process by the FEC/FDC byte allocator 252; new parameters for transmission, in order to reduce error within the data; figure 12; column 14 lines 10-25) (figure 12; column 13 line 63 – column 14 line 35).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Blair et al. with Bordogna et al. Since hardware is necessary to execute the process described by Bordogna et al. Also, a device for controlling a digital wrapper according to the error detected is necessary so that errors can be reduces.

Consider **claim 7**, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. Note, Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. discloses both, devices and methods on with the devices can be set up to execute, in order to detect errors within the data and perform error correction. Further, the optical transport network frame structure as disclosed by Blair conforms to ITU-T G.709, which mean the transport network has multi layers.

Consider **claim 2, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. further disclose; when the digital wrapper interrupt processor detects an interrupt with respect to the received signal from the digital wrapper and determines that the received signal

Art Unit: 2613

has a defect (read as, when performing parity check and errors are found within the data), the digital wrapper interrupt processor calls the defect and maintenance signal detector to allow it to detect the defect (read as, data is stored and FEC correction bits are calculated to determine the location of the errors) (Bordogna et al.; figure 8; column 9 lines 10-25).

Consider **claim 4, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. further disclose, wherein a signal that is received and transmitted by the optical transponder has a structure that maps a client signal to a payload and includes an error correction code and an overhead (figure 2, shows a frame structure that includes, an overhead section which carries a forward error correction section, and a payload section (Bordogna et al.; figure 2).

7. **Claims 3, 8 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bordogna et al. (US Patent #6,683,855)** in view of **Blair et al. (US Patent 7,028,241)** and further in view of **Little et al. (US Patent # 4,268,722)**.

Consider **claim 3, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. disclosed the invention as described above; except for, wherein the digital wrapper interrupt processor sets a defect mask for each layer and processes an interrupt of each layer when the defect mask therefor is true.

In related art, Little et al. disclose a telephone communications system. Wherein incoming pulse-code-modulation (PCM) channels (read as, the equivalent of the plurality of layers within the digital wrapper) can be mask using a mask bit. The purpose of the mask bit is for selectively masking particular bits of the selected PCM channel/s. Such, that those bits that

Art Unit: 2613

are masked are ignore for further processing (abstract; column 19 lines 64-68; column 20 lines 1-8; column 21 lines 60-65; and claim 14).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Little et al. with Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. Since adding the ability to selective executing error detection and correction for particular signals increase Network management flexibility. Also it would increase processing speed of a network, since some signal might not need error protection; thus, the ability to ignore (or exclude) those signals from error detection and correction process would increase the overall speed of the network.

Consider **claim 8, and as applied to claim 7 above**, claim 8 is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above. Further, Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. and further as modified by Little et al. clearly disclose the process of using a mask bit (read as, setting a defect mask for each later), such that, only a selected number of signals are subject to further signal processing (read as, processing an interrupt of each layer when the defect mask therefor is true), while other signals are ignore (Little et al.; abstract; column 19 lines 64-68; column 20 lines 1-8; column 21 lines 60-65; and claim 14).

Consider **claim 9, and as applied to claim 8 above**, claim 9 is rejected for same reasoning as claim 8 above, see the explanation in claim 8, which explains how mask bits are use to process certain selected signals while ignoring other signals.

Art Unit: 2613

8. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bordogna et al.** (US Patent #6,683,855) in view of **Blair et al.** (US Patent 7,028,241) and further in view of **Tezuka** (US Patent # 7,028,231).

Consider **claim 5**, and as applied to **claim 4** above; Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. disclosed the invention as described above; except for, a transmitter information providing part for providing information required to be delivered to a receiving side through the overhead of the transmitted signal; and a receiver information providing part for providing an expected value of information required to be received through the overhead.

In related art, Tezuka discloses a performance monitoring for optical transmission system. Wherein, one of the steps for error detection and correction method includes using parity calculations and comparisons. Parity is calculated and included in the overhead portion of each frame before transmission. When receiving a frame, parity is again calculated and compared with the parity stored in the overhead portion of each frame. If the two parities are not the same, a disparity flag is set (abstract; figure 3; column 4 lines 55-65 and column 1-15).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Tezuka with Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. Since using parity checking is a simple and fast method for indicated occurrences of errors within the received data. Thus, using parity checking can speed up signal processing process.

9. **Claims 6 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bordogna et al.** (US Patent #6,683,855) in view of **Blair et al.** (US Patent 7,028,241) and further in view of **Sheridan et al.** (US Patent # 6,725,032).

Consider **claim 6 and as applied to claim 1 above**, Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. disclosed the invention as described above; except for, a remote information display for displaying presence/absence of a defect and the quantity of BIP-errors according to the result of the defect and maintenance signal processor; a defect correlation reporting part for finding the cause of the defect to report it; and a performance monitoring part for monitoring a performance value of the received signal to report it.

In related art, Sheridan et al. disclose a cell network management system. Wherein, the alarm reporting system and configuration error unit display any occurrences of errors to the user, including the numbers of errors. Errors are identified, so that for each error, the severity, error type (read as, cause of defect), and a description of the error is display to the user. Also, within the configuration data and alarms elements 312, has performance monitoring systems (figures 3, 6, 8; column 5 lines 27-35; column 8 lines 34-42; column 9 lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Sheridan et al. with Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. Because the user can manage/troubleshoot the network better and more efficiently when he/she know the cause of the error and the performance of the network.

Consider **claim 10, and as applied to claim 7 above**, see claim 6. Bordogna et al. as modified by Blair et al. and further as modified by Sheridan et al. clearly disclose the apparatus and method of displaying errors, error rate, cause of error and performance monitoring.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 12/05/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 7 first paragraph, the applicant argues that Blair did not disclose or mention an optical transponder and method of operating an optical transponder. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, in figure 12 of Blair's disclose is shown an output edge component 244; wherein the input optical signal is process such that, the FEC decoder 248 corrects the byte errors in the data frame, the corrected data frame is deframed by deframer 250 then output the data to the client. The definition of an optical transponder in the broadest sense is an optical device, which can transmit and receive signals. The output edge component 244 as disclosed by Blair meets the limitations, since it is an optical device, and it can receive and transmit signals, as shown in figure 12 and column 13 line 63 – column 14 line 36.

Applicant further argues that Little et al., Tezuka, and Sheridan et al. also fails to disclose an optical transponder and method of operating an optical transponder in sections B-D. Since those reference are use in combination with Blair et al.; it would have been obvious that the combined teaching including that of Blair et al. teaches an optical transponder and method of operating an optical transponder, since Blair et al. teaches an optical transponder and the method of operating an optical transponder. See explanation above.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 2613

Examiner should be directed to Thi Le whose telephone number is (571) 270-1104. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Rafael Perez-Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.



KENNETH VANDERPUYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Thi Le

KENNETH VANDERPUYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER